October 30, 1971

Jim Lesar
[illegible]

Dear Jim,

After discovering the [illegible] memo in _Ramparts_ and _Liberation_ last month, I can't say I was surprised by Fraps's article this month. It [illegible] quite upset and disappointed. Has this article been on Bakeley's desk for a year, or is it possible that Fraps does not know that any of the 'classified' info he wrote about was released months ago? Didn't the CIA's cash-landed computer system "being developed to help researchers ... with the analysis" tell him that the organization of which he is an officer has a set?

My first [illegible] reaction, of course, was to send [illegible] copies of [illegible] 71 and [illegible] 71, which get special mention in the article. Needless to say, the latter [illegible] 'to check' reveal Ewald's interview status, or that he had the phone numbers of his [illegible] agents in his notebook. It should have been obvious that, since page 47 of Ewald's notebook has [illegible] other [illegible] phone numbers (1 [illegible]), an [illegible] report on them might be withheld to hide the nature or extent of the [illegible]'s operations in Mexico, which they correctly have considered sensitive. What can one do with people who insist on the most sinister possible explanation for everything?

I decided that it would be a futility for me to try to start a discussion of facts like this with Fraps and Berkeley. They and I clearly [illegible] differ greatly on what constitutes logical analysis and sound proof. Aside from the gross factual errors - which should be an embarrassment to Fraps - the article is full of nonsense. I think that kind of [illegible] writing will do long-term [illegible] if it is [illegible] not probed in a solid factual [illegible]. I am sure [illegible] knows that there are [illegible] many people, me included, who would be glad to look over anything he writes and correct factual inaccuracies. If he chooses not to do so, that is his problem.

Have you told [illegible] about the availability of these [illegible]? If nobody else has done so, I guess I will, but given the nature of our recent contacts I think it would be better if you did it.

Another reason I decided not to write Fraps or [illegible] right away is that it seems possible that the article is some sort of operation by our own "department of disinformation." Certainly its publication is less potentially damaging to serious [illegible] research than that of the [illegible] memo.

Unless, of course, one is concerned about the damage to the reputation of the entire critical community. I would like to know your reaction, and that of others in the [illegible], to this article. I hope that its faults are not obvious only to those of us who have worked primarily with Archives material. As long as I am a member of the [illegible] I do feel some responsibility to express my views on what constitutes irresponsible scholarship; [illegible] is in several ways just as ethically [illegible] repulsive as what the Warren Commission did. Hopefully, however, there is no need to [illegible] belabor what to me is obvious. Certainly we shouldn't have to tell Fraps and Berkeley to check the easily checkable facts!

Fraps wrote that the [illegible] has recent statements from one of the [illegible] agents [illegible] reported to in his informer's role. Can you tell me anything about this one?

I agree with what you said in your letter of the 5th, that our efforts are better [illegible] spent away from such secondary issues. The enclosed (non-confidential) letter to Mitchell sums up the status of my pending Freedom of Information requests.

Some other odds and ends:

From the ~~fragmentary~~ fragmentary press reports, I gather that the suit concerning the Anchitka test may provide some relevant precedents for our ~~XXX~~ of ~~XXX~~ work. I assume you are ~~XXX~~ following it very closely.

Are we having anyone at the conference on the ~~XXX~~ at Princeton this weekend?

I haven't gotten the copy of Glyda's article which you said ~~XXX~~ you would send me.

There is a new book by John McGoldrick, "Law for Action," on the law, Urban, and law tricle. I haven't seen it and it is a bit expensive, but it might be valuable.

You asked if I am keeping up on the Urban business in L.A. Only through ~~XXX~~ what I see in the L.A. Mayor and the L.A. Free Press, which is very little.

~~XXX~~ I didn't look a bit on the 3 which I just skimmed. It seems to emphasize that the reason for the Population was to ~~XXX~~ [illegible] future (but might have been more concerned with other arrays) I do thanks the writers of the Population, but the best he can say for that is that they worked hard, and such - I didn't see his endorsing their conclusions.

Sincerely,

Paul

Paul Ehrlich

cc: ~~XXX~~